

CITY OF CHICAGO - DEPARTMENT OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES

JANUARY 15, 2014

ADDENDUM NO. 2

To

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL ("RFP")

FOR

**MOBILE HANDHELDS FOR PARKING CITATIONS- HARDWARE, SOFTWARE, SERVICE &
SUPPORT**

SPECIFICATION NO: 118791

For which Proposals are scheduled to be received no later than 4:00 p.m., Central Time on January 17, 2014 (pursuant to the Request for Proposal advertised November 08, 2013) in the Department of Procurement Services, Bid & Bond Room (Room 301 of City Hall).

Respondent must acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 2 in the Cover Letter of its Proposal AND should complete and return the attached Acknowledgment by facsimile to 312-744-9687.

Attn: Altha Riley, Senior Procurement Specialist

This document contains:

- I. Notice of Proposal Due Date Postponement**
- II. Notice of Revisions and Changes;**
- III. Answers to 68 questions submitted for clarification of the RFP; and**
- IV. Addendum Receipt Acknowledgment.**

The information contained in this Addendum No.2 is incorporated by reference into the original Request for Proposal (RFP) issued on November 08, 2013.

CITY OF CHICAGO - DEPARTMENT OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES

JANUARY 15, 2014

ADDENDUM NO. 2

To

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL ("RFP")

FOR

**MOBILE HANDHELDS FOR PARKING CITATIONS- HARDWARE, SOFTWARE, SERVICE &
SUPPORT**

SPECIFICATION NO: 118791

For which proposals are due in the Department of Procurement Services, Bid and Bond Room, Room 301, City Hall, 121 N. LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois 60602, at 4:00 p.m., Central Time, January 17, 2014.

The following revisions/changes will be incorporated in the above-referenced RFP document. All other provisions and requirements as originally set forth remain in full force and are binding.

RESPONDENT SHOULD ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THIS ADDENDUM IN THE COVER LETTER SUBMITTED WITH YOUR PROPOSAL.

SECTION I: NOTICE OF PROPOSAL DUE DATE POSTPONEMENT

REVISION DESCRIPTION

- 1. The previously advertised proposed due date has been postponed. PROPOSALS ARE NOW DUE NO LATER THAN 4:00 P.M. CENTRAL TIME ON FEBRUARY 03, 2014, IN THE BID & BOND ROOM (ROOM 301), CITY HALL, 121 NORTH LASALLE STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60602.**

LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

SECTION II: NOTICE OF REVISIONS/CHANGES

1. **The second paragraph of SECTION 1.2 Background - Current and New General Scope Requirements has been deleted in its entirety and replaced as follows:**

The Contractor's hosted system processes the data and also feeds the processed data to the City's CANVAS system. The Contractor-hosted system also pushes data wirelessly to the HHCs. For example, a file of boot-eligible license plates can be sent to the PEAs. A segment of the Contractor-hosted system is also configured to be viewable by the public via the Internet – by logging into the City of Chicago's domain website, a link is there on the City's site for the user to input and thereby access certain information about an individual violation, although the actual content is managed at the Contractor's hosted site. Such current functionalities must be part of the proposed solution. Currently, parking enforcement operations are, for the most part, 24/7 operations. DOF considers it will likely require approximately 175-225 wireless HHC units and, if necessary, 3-4 Base Stations throughout the City.

2. **The last paragraph of SECTION 1.2. Background - Current and New General Scope Requirements has been deleted in its entirety and replaced as follows:**

Respondents should propose various solutions such as: one-piece HHC units incorporated with a printer or two-piece HHC units with a separate wireless printer. Respondents should also propose other available options such as RFID-reader functionality (and the ability to purchase chips or tags to be embedded (either by the City or Vendor) into objects to be "read" by the RFID reader), LPR functionality, etc. **All proposed HHC solutions must meet or exceed Mandatory requirements outlined in this RFP or its proposal will be deemed to be non-responsive.** Preference will be given to those solutions which in addition to meeting Mandatory requirements also meet preferred requirements. Proposed Optional functionality will not be considered in the evaluation of proposed overall solutions. Additionally Respondent should propose both equipment purchase and lease options.

3. **The first paragraph of SECTION 2.1. Required Proposal Format has been deleted in its entirety and replaced as follows:**

Respondents are advised to adhere to the submittal requirements of the RFP and in particular this section. The Proposal must include the information outlined in the following subsections. Please prepare your Proposal by using each heading in this section on required proposal content and in the same order as listed below. Failure to comply with the instructions of this RFP may be cause for rejection of the non-compliant Proposal.

If Respondent is proposing more than one solution, Respondent must separate applicable information pertinent to the particular solution by a tabbed divider so the City can clearly distinguish which submittals apply to different solutions. Item 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.9, 2.2.10, 2.2.11, 2.2.12, and 2.2.13 will universally apply to each solution and only one submittal is necessary. Sections 2.2.3, 2.2.4, 2.2.5, 2.2.6, 2.2.7, 2.2.8, Attachment 1, and Cost Proposal table are unique and specific to each solution and should be included for each solution proposed. If the same information applies to one or more solution, indicate this in the submittal.

4. **Exhibit 5, Cost Proposal, has been deleted in its entirety and replaced with Exhibit 5, Addendum No. 2 Cost Proposal.**

5. Attachment 1, City of Chicago's HHC Properties Checklist, has been deleted in its entirety and replaced with Addendum 2 , Attachment 1, City of Chicago HHC Properties Checklist.

LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

SECTION III: Answers to 68 questions submitted for clarification of the RFP

Question 1: Who is the incumbent?

Answer: The current contractor is Duncan Parking Technologies, Inc.

Current contract information can be found at www.cityofchicago.org/procurement.

- 1. Click on Contract Administration.*
- 2. Click on [Awarded](#) Contracts*
- 3. Click on City of Chicago.*
- 4. Click on Contract and Awards.*
- 5. Search by Vendor Name or PO#*

Question 2: Does handheld software currently need Microsoft OS to run due to a resident application or the devise?

Answer: No.

Question 3: Is Windows OS required on handheld devices?

Answer: No.

Question 4: In Attachment 2, references a secure connection with Verizon. If another provider has a similar secure connection with the City would that be considered for this RFP?

Answer: Yes.

Question 5: Most of the large cities we work with prefer to have a separate handheld unit with a wireless printer on a belt. This is largely due to weight and arm considerations. Is the City open to considering this type of set up for the handhelds & printers?

Answer: Yes.

Question 6: May we receive a copy of the sign in sheet?

Answer: A copy of the sign in sheet can be found at www.cityofchicago.org/procurement.

- 1. Click on Contract Administration.*
- 2. Click on View All Services*
- 3. Click on Pre-Bid and Pre-Submittal Conference Attendees.*
- 4. Click on 2013 Pre-Bid and Pre-Submittal Conference Attendees.*

Question 7: Regarding references, do they need to be U.S. based?

Answer: Yes.

Question 8: What criteria on references are considered “comparable (e.g. # of handhelds, complexity of system, etc.?)

Answer: References for contracts which are similar in scope and size to City of Chicago's requirements are preferred.

Question 9: Is the City currently using RFD on the meters? If yes, can you describe?

Answer: No. Currently RFIDs are not used on meters.

Question 10: Is the required proposal content required of both Prime contractors as well as subcontractors? Or simply required of primes?

Answer: If Respondent proposes that major portions of the work will be performed by different team members (e.g. joint venture partners, subcontractors, etc.). Respondent must provide the required information as described in Section 2.2, Required Proposal Content of the RFP for each such team member.

Question 11: 1. What type of database is used with the CANVAS System? Can more details be supplied as to the interface/requirements?

Answer: The CANVAS database is Oracle 11 g.

The daily ticket file and corresponding images will be uploaded to an external FTP server provided by the vendor by an agreed upon timeframe to be retrieved by the City for upload into CANVAS. The data in the daily ticket file must follow the following file format:

TICKET FILE					
----- FIELD LEVEL/NAME -----	--PICTURE--	FLD	START	END	
			1	268	
CITY NUMBER	99	3	1	2	
TICKET NUMBER	9(11)	4	3	13	
RECORD TYPE	X	5	14	14	
SEQUENCE NUMBER	99	6	15	16	
ALTERNATE ID TYPE	X	9	17	17	
ISSUE DATE (MMDDYY)	X(6)	10	18	23	
ISSUE TIME (HHMM)	X(4)	14	24	27	
AM-PM INDICATOR	X	17	28	28	
LICENSE PLATE	X(8)	18	29	36	
LICENSE PLATE STATE	XX	19	37	38	
LICENSE PLATE TYPE	XXX	20	39	41	
VEHICLE MAKE	X(5)	21	42	46	
VEHICLE TYPE	XXX	23	47	49	
VEHICLE COLOR	X(6)	24	50	55	
VIOLATION LOCATION	X(25)	25	56	80	
METER NUMBER	X(6)	27	81	86	
FILLER	X	28	87	87	
ALTERNATE ID	X(20)	29	88	107	
OFFICER ID	X(5)	30	108	112	
VIOLATION CODE 1	X(15)	31	113	127	
VIOLATION CODE 2	X(15)	31	128	142	
VIOLATION CODE 3	X(15)	31	143	157	
REPORTING DISTRICT	X(4)	32	158	161	
REGISTRATION DATE (MM/YY)	X(5)	33	162	166	
VEHICLE SPEED		34	167	169	
POSTED SPEED LIMIT		35	170	172	
SPEED UNIT	X(3)	36	173	175	
USER ID	X(21)*	37	176	196	
Note: This layout is used for TCKT_TYP = 'PARK' and TCKT_NUM that begin with 9 and are 10 digits					

Autocite Comment 1	X (60)	38	197	256
Autocite Comment 2	X (60)	39	257	316

Vendor will also be required to provide a data file listing the photos as a validation and reconciliation tool. For example:

header record: # of photos in the daily batch
photo record (1 per photo image)
Columns 1 thru 10 - Ticket #
Columns 11 thru 31 - Photo image name

Sample:

918488384420131209 213040.JPG

918488384920131209 214144.JPG

918488385120131209 214623.JPG

918488384320131209 212828.JPG

918488384320131209 212820.JPG

918488885520131209 195423.JPG

918488384520131209 213412.JPG

918488885520131209 195414.JPG

918488885520131209 195406.JPG

Question 12. Can the City provide any additional details on the View citation information only online? Does the customer currently 'log in'? If so, how does the customer currently 'log in'? What information needs to be provided by the customer to see the citation information?

Answer: The online tool will be accessed via a link from the City's website and currently only requires the customer to input a Citation number and VIN or license plate. See link

<https://parkingtickets.cityofchicago.org/CPSWeb/web/EnterTickets.jsp>

The Vendor-hosted site will present the motorist with certain relevant data (as determined by the City).

Question 13. What are the City's expectations regarding real-time connection to Canvas? Real time to hotlist in Police Database? SOS? Parking Meter Maintenance Database?

Answer: The City's expectation, ideally, is to realize no more than a 4-second cycle time to query multiple databases simultaneously (e.g., CANVAS, hotlists, vehicle registration data, pay-parking-by cell databases, as needed and return applicable results. The ideal solution would, for example, enable the PEA to input one license plate, hit enter, which would then trigger the application to simultaneously and automatically query multiple databases, and return/display applicable information from multiple queried databases, if applicable, within 4 seconds on the PEA's handheld device.

Question 14. Who is the current 3rd party parking by phone provider?

Answer: Passport Parking, LLC.

Question 15. How would the city plan to use RFID capabilities? Can the City provide more information on the ability to purchase RFID chips or tags to be embedded (either by the City or Vendor) into objects to be “read” by the RFID reader; What objects and for what purpose?

Answer: Refer to Section 2.2.6 g.(iv) RFID option capability of the RFP, which provides examples of how the City may potentially use RFID capabilities as part of its mobile handheld operations. The City may or may not purchase RFID chips or tags, but would like the ability to do so if an RFID solution becomes an operational objective.

Question 16. What type of mobile phones is in use by the city? Who is the cellular provider?

Answer: Currently, Casio REVINE and Blackberry. Verizon provides cellular network service.

Question 17. Is the city open to an option to add the handheld ticket writer cellular service to the City’s current plan?

Answer: The Respondent must propose a solution that requires HHC wireless operations to perform independently from the City of Chicago’s cellular service provider. However, if, in the sole judgment of the City, it is determined to be in the best interest of the City to propose the City’s cellular service contract, in whole or in part, to be included with the selected Respondent’s solution, then such solution may be negotiated.

Question 18. Should the vendor supply the HHC ticket stock and envelopes or would the city prefer to purchase ticket stock (per required specifications) and envelopes outside of this contract?

Answer: Vendor will be required to supply ticket stock and envelopes. (Approximately 1.5 million per year.)

Question 19. Does the City expect to require a testing period and testing agreement? If so, what is the expected timeframe?

Answer: Refer Section 4, Selection Process, Live Demonstration of Equipment of the RFP, and reference to Exhibit 7, Testing Agreement.

Question 20. How many concurrent users will require access to the parking management system database and peak times?

Answer: The question is understood to ask: How many PEAs could potentially be querying the Vendor-hosted system or CANVAS at peak times (usually during day time hours). Answer is: 175-225.

Question 21. Is the City interested in collection services provided by the vendor?

Answer: No.

Question 22. Please confirm (from the pre-bid meeting) that the City will consider a two-piece handheld ticket writer.

Answer: The City will consider a two-piece HHC.

Question 23. What consumer solutions would the City like to offer to parkers and violators? Citation Payment, Appeals, etc.

Answer: “Consumer solutions” such as payments and appeals are outside the scope of this contract.

Question 24: RFP Ref. Section 1.2, p. 2: The RFP requests real-time wireless interfaces with the CANVAS system for scofflaw eligibility. Please describe the preferred real-time communication method(s) by which a vendor will communicate with the CANVAS System.

Answer: The Respondent should propose a real-time communications solution or optional solutions and the pros and cons of each method. The City shall determine the preferred method based on what is deemed to be the best proposed solution meeting the City’s needs.

Question 25: RFP Ref. Section 1.2, p. 2: The RFP requests real-time wireless interfaces with the “hot” plate lists from law enforcement. Please describe the preferred real-time communication method(s) desired by which a vendor will communicate with the law enforcement system.

Answer: The Respondent should propose a real-time communications solution or optional solutions and describe the pros and cons of each solution. The City shall determine the preferred method based on what is deemed to be the best proposed solution meeting the City’s needs.

Question 26: RFP Ref. Section 1.2, p. 2: The RFP requests real-time wireless interfaces with the Illinois Secretary of State Vehicle information database. Please describe the information that would be received from the database and how the handheld application would use that information. Does a real-time interface with the Illinois Secretary of State exist today that would permit use by a parking application as opposed to a sworn law enforcement application? If so, please describe the preferred real-time communication method(s) by which a vendor will communicate with the law enforcement system.

Answer: The City shall require its PEAs to utilize the HHC to determine if an Illinois license plate is registered to a City of Chicago street address through communication with the Illinois Secretary of State or another database. Currently, real-time access into the Illinois Secretary of State’s (ISOS) database is available to City of Chicago authorized personnel.

Question 27: RFP Ref. Section 1.2, p. 2: The RFP requests real-time wireless interfaces with the meter vendors. Please identify the meter vendor and associated models for all the meters that the City wishes the vendor to communicate with. Please describe the preferred real-time communications methods that are available for each meter vendor/model.

Answer: The City of Chicago’s meter vendor is *Chicago Parking Meters, LLC* (“CPM”). The City does not consider it a requirement for the successful Respondent’s HHC to communicate with any meter model. But, the City shall require certain information from CPM’s pay-by-cell service provider (currently: *Passport Parking, LLC*) to be delivered to the HHC in order for the PEA to determine if the vehicle in question is in violation or not as regards a pay-by-cell matter.

Question 28: RFP Ref. Section 2.1, p. 7: The RFP requests that proposers submit “one (1) hardcopy original Proposal and seven (7) electronic copies of the Proposal in PDF format on CD-ROMs or flash drives.” Please confirm that the copies requested are electronic only or whether hardcopies accompanied by electronic copies are requested.

Answer: Instructions in Section 1.4.4 Deadlines and Procedures for Submitting Proposals must be followed. Refer to Revision 2 and 3 of this Addendum 2.

Question 29: RFP Ref. Attachment 1, Item 58, p. 7: The HHC Properties Checklist includes several items which are indicated as “M” (“Mandatory”), but which appear to be “Preferred,”

“Optional,” or otherwise dependent upon the City’s eventual decision regarding a preferred device. For example, while Item 58 is indicated as Mandatory for a full QWERTY keypad and other features, that same requirement includes a parenthetical note that “this is subject to type of HHC.” Please confirm how such items should be interpreted. Would it be acceptable to the City to interpret such requirements as “Preferred” or “Optional” and present the City with information regarding the benefits and drawbacks of what is available or included in proposed devices?

Answer: See Addendum 2, Attachment 1, City of Chicago’s HHC Properties Checklist.

Question 30: RFP Ref. Exhibit 5, Cost Proposal, PDF p. 71: The cost form includes the term “layered unit of measure”. Is it correct to interpret this to mean unit breaks or volume-based pricing; i.e. separate pricing for 1 to 10 units, 10-50 units, or 50+ units?

Answer: It can, where applicable.

Question 31: RFP Ref. Exhibit 8, Special Conditions Regarding MBE/WBE, PDF p. 135: The RFP includes MBE and WBE participation goals of zero percent. Given this goal, please confirm whether “Good Faith Effort” or other outreach documentation is required for vendors’ proposals.

Answer: The MBE/WBE requirement for this RFP is No Stated Goals, as stated in Section 2.2.11 of the RFP. Good Faith Effort documentation is a not a submittal requirement.

Question 32: What mobile phones do the Police Officers currently use? (Reference: page 2, paragraph 6)

Answer: The Chicago Police Department Police Officers currently do not use mobile phones. Certain management or special team members of the Police Department may currently use Blackberry devices for communication purposes. However, it is not anticipated these devices will be utilized to issue Parking or Compliance violations.

Question 33: What parking meters are currently installed in the City?

Answer: The type of meters installed in the City are irrelevant to this RFP.

Question 34: Does the City have an existing pay-by-cell phone provider? If so, who is the provider? If not, does the City want to receive pay-by-cell phone proposals? (Reference: page 2, paragraph 2)

Answer: The City of Chicago does not have an existing pay-by-cell provider. The City of Chicago has a contract with *Chicago Parking Meters, LLC*, and *Chicago Parking Meters, LLC* has a contract with a pay-by-cell provider, *Passport Parking, LLC*. The City of Chicago does not want to receive any pay-by-cell phone proposals for parking meters.

Question 35: Attachment 1, page 4, Section 28, Item 28 of the Functionality Requirements requires that the HHC weight not exceed 2 lbs. “Please confirm that this weight limit is applicable for only a one-piece solution and that if a two-piece solution is proposed, where the printer is a separate and detached device, then the handheld device and its battery together, are subject to the 2 lbs. limit.

Answer: Yes, 2 lbs. is the weight limit for either a one-piece or 2-piece solution. No one piece can weigh more than 2 pounds.

Question 36: RFP Page 1, Section 1.2, Issue Parking and Compliance Violations "What is a Compliance Violation Process and what are the data elements associated with it?"

Answer: A Compliance Violation may be any violation of Municipal Code of Chicago. For purposes of this RFP, all compliance violations will be issued and processed in the same manner as a parking violation.

Question 37: Attachment 1 - Page 1, Section 1, The host system must upload the ticket data and corresponding images from the HHC ... to the City's CANVAS system for further processing What are the interface specifications to CANVAS?

Answer: See answer to Question 11.

Question 38: Attachment 1 - Page 1, Section 3, System must be able to communicate with multiple databases, including third-party databases, real-time and simultaneously. What other databases are the vendors required to interface with? What are the interface specifications?

Answer: See Answer to Question 13. Specific interface specifications will be established for each data source as the related functionality is implemented on the handheld device. Specific details may vary from system to system, but are generally expected to use common API and web service technology.

Question 39: Attachment 1 - Page 3, Section 24, All voided tickets must have audit trail to view and print from hosted system. What is the city's current Voided Ticket process?

Answer: The City's current system allows for management to void a citation prior to it being transmitted to CANVAS. PEAs may also void a citation via the handheld if an error is made and provided management approval is obtained. The Vendor's system must maintain a record of all voided tickets.

Question 40: Attachment 1 - Page 5, Section 42, Software must allow for the capture of broken meter information as well as generate a file of broken meter data. "What is interface requirement for the broken meter file?"

Answer:

Column Name	Description	Data Type	Primary Key	Null?
MTR_NUM	Meter Number	NUMBER(8)	N	N
MTR_LOC	Meter Location	VARCHAR2(30)	N	N
PRBLM_START_DT	Problem Start Date	DATE	N	N
PRBLM_END_DT	Problem End Date	DATE	N	N
PRBLM_DESC	Problem Description	VARCHAR2(50)	N	N
CRT_DT	Create Date	DATE	N	N

Question 41: Attachment 1 - Page 5, Section 44, The HHC must produce an audible signal such as a "beep" as well as a visual indicator to alert the PEA and notification (e.g., text message, email, low battery, low memory, etc., notifications from other parties as determined by the City of Chicago (e.g., dispatch, OEMC, etc.) What are the interface requirements for other parties as determined by the City of Chicago?

Answer: Notifications and interfaces with other parties' systems will be defined over the term of the contract and implemented as needed. In your response detail how your solution can currently accept and exchange information with third-party systems. If there are specific systems or products with which you have standard, built-in interfaces, please identify them.

Question 42: Attachment 1 - Page 6, Section 45, All data uploaded to the HHC must be in configurable tables (violation code, violation description, fine amount street names, etc. "1. Can CANVAS provide data feeds to the HHC system to provide violation codes, street names etc.? 2. What are the interface specifications?"

Answer: The following is the file layout to provide the data feeds of the violation code, violation description and fine amounts.

Field Name	Position	Format
Violation Code	001-015	Alphanum
Violation Code Description	016-065	Alphanum
Fine Level 1 Amount	066-069	Numeric Left Padded Zeros

Fixed Length Text File

A typical Street Name interface example follows. A variation of this can be provided based on the needs of the project:

DIR	STREET_NAME	TYPE	SUF_DIR	FULLNAME	TIERED	MIN_ADDRESS	MAX_ADDRESS
W	POSTOFFICE	RD		W POSTOFFICE RD	N	0.0000000	0.0000000
S	INDIANA	AVE		S INDIANA AVE		1,200.0000000	13,799.0000000
S	JASPER	PL		S JASPER PL		3,600.0000000	3,699.0000000
S	JOURDAN	CT		S JOURDAN CT		1,900.0000000	1,999.0000000
S	KEDZIE	AVE		S KEDZIE AVE		1.0000000	11,499.0000000
S	KENNEDY	EXPY	IB	S KENNEDY EXPY IB		1.0000000	509.0000000

Question 43: Attachment 1 - Page 6, Section 53, The user should not have to exit the main ticket screen to access other application screens. Migration between screens should be direct by, for example, tapping buttons at the bottom or top of application screens, or keypad interactions What applications does the City plan to install on the HHCs other than the enforcement application?

Answer: The City may elect to install optional applications onto its HHCs as business requirements may dictate and HHC capacity and operability may allow, provided such applications and requirements are included in the contract between the City and Vendor.

Question 44: Attachment 1 - Page 10, Section 80, Capability to print and configure variable Quick Response (QR) codes on violations. The QR Codes will tie to the ticket number. Static QR codes are not acceptable. What should the QR Code point to? A City website or the vendor's hosted site?

Answer: QR codes are not currently used by the City. In the future , they will be required to be printed on the violation to direct citizens to the City's website.

Question 45: Attachment 1 - Page 15, Section 129, There must be a at least one USB port. What is the USB port on the HHC used for?

Answer: The requirement as originally stated in Section 129 has been deleted and replaced with Addendum 2, Attachment 1, Section 129. Assuming the HHC application is storing all data locally, there also needs to be some software or hardware in place to transfer that data from the handheld device to the CANVAS system. If the data transfer is not done via a USB port, explain in your response how that will be accomplished.

Question 46: Attachment 1 - Page 15, Section 130, The serial port must support an external modem What is the external modem accessed via the Serial Port used for?

Answer: The requirement as originally stated in Section 129 has been deleted.

Question 47: Attachment 1 - Page 15, Section 136, HHC must be able to communicate with multiple databases, including third-party databases efficiently, wirelessly, real-time and simultaneously. What databases? What are the interface specifications?

Answer: See Answer to Question13 and Question 38.

Question 48: Section 1.2 Background "through mobile phones already in use" "Please provide information on the manufacturer and model, operating system, and data plans of the mobile phones already in use. "Please clarify that LPR software, RFID capability and QR code capability are all optional services.

Answer: Yes, LPR software and RFID capability are optional services. QR code capability is not optional.

The Department of Finance is currently using the following two devices on the Verizon Network:

- Casio Ravine 2
 - OS: Brew Mobile Platform (Brew MP)
 - Data Plan: Unlimited
 - LPR Software: NA
 - RFID Capability: No
 - QR Code Scanner Capability: Yes
- Blackberry 9930
 - OS: 7.1. (Bundle 2705)

- Data Plan: Unlimited
- LPR Software: Available
- RFID Capability: Yes
- QR Code Scanner Capability: Yes

QR codes are not currently used by the City. In the future they will be required to be printed on the violation to direct citizens to the City's web link to pay violation or request hearing.

Question 49: Section 4, "test proposed equipment for a maximum trial period of up to 2 months" Will the trial period extend to all of the qualified respondents at this stage of the evaluation or solely with the City's preferred respondent? What evaluation criteria will be used to determine if the respondent is successful in the trial?

Answer: The trial applies to all of the Respondents deemed qualified to move on to Phase III of the RFP process. The evaluation criteria used to determine if a Respondent is successful in the trial is, generally, based on demonstrated performance.

Question 50: Section 2.2.6 g i- Ability to provide RFID (or similar transponder-like) technology solutions for use in various objects (e.g., pay- and-display meters; vehicle decals; etc.) whereby data about the object can be managed at the Vendor-hosted system and be readable by the HHC. Do the meters on the street today have RFID tags in them and are they UHF or something else? Are the RFID tags in the meter housing or somewhere else?

"How many enforcement offices does the City have today and what are their plans for the future?"

Answer: There are no plans for RFID currently. Assuming the question was asking how many enforcement officers, there are currently 170 parking enforcement aides (PEAs) enforcing via a mobile handheld device; not including Chicago Police officers or other designated personnel authorized to issue parking and compliance violations.

Question 51: Attachment 1 , Section 97, A detachable AC adapter must be included. The adapter must operate from a standard 110/115 volt 60 Hz power source. It must be capable of running the HHC indefinitely, even if the batteries are discharged, damaged or missing. All power connections into the HHC must be resistant to damage caused by connecting and disconnecting the adapter. Is the City expecting the AC adapters to plug into vehicle cigarette lighters in City owned vehicles or is there a USB power port or something else in the vehicle that that AC adapter would connect to?

Answer: The City will require the HHC to be chargeable via 110 outlet and an optional vehicle cigarette lighter adapter should also be available. (See "car charger" under "Chargers" line item on Addendum 2, Cost Proposal page Exhibit 5).

Question 52: How many Parking Tickets are issued via HHC annually?

Answer: There are an average is 1.5 million parking and compliance violations issued per year.

Question 53: What is the average number of Photos taken for each Parking Ticket?

Answer: 3.

Question 54: How many Compliance Violations are issued via HHC annually?

Answer: See answer to Question 52.

Question 55: What is the average number of Photos taken for each Compliance Violation?

Answer: 3.

Question 56: How many Paper Parking Tickets are issued annually?

Answer:

	<u>2012</u>	<u>thru 11/30/13</u>
Parking	556,771	556,184

Question 57: How many Paper Compliance Violations are issued annually?

Answer:

	<u>2012</u>	<u>thru 11/30/13</u>
Compliance	346,900	428,894

Question 58: The RFP requests 275-300 HHCs to be implemented across multiple locations. Do each of the potential locations have sufficient electrical capacity and storage capability for the HHCs and associated printers (assuming a 2-piece device)? Is the respondent responsible for the cost of installing/upgrading electrical and or storage capacity?

Answer: The Vendor is not responsible for providing any electrical work. However, if the proposed HHC requires special outlets, then the Vendor must provide such outlets. (Itemize any special items on the Exhibit 5, Addendum 2, Cost Proposal sheet.) The Vendor is responsible for upgrading storage capacity to the HHC if required, but the Vendor is not responsible for providing any additional real estate to increase the City's physical storage capacity at any of its locations.

Question 59, 2.2.6 f, Does The City and/or DOF have a contract exclusive or non-exclusive with a particular wireless carrier today? What is that carrier or carriers if there are more than one. Does the City have a preference towards a particular wireless carrier?

Answer: The City has wireless service agreements with AT&T, Sprint and Verizon. All three are supported.

Question 60, 2.2.6 g Ability to provide RFID....

Please describe how RFID technology is being applied today in the current system?

If not in the current system, please list the programs where RFID is intended to be used. i.e. Please state if RFID is planned to be used in pay and display receipts or in other pay and display applications. Please state if RFID is planned to be used in vehicle decals. If so, what kind of decals? What is the probability that RFID will be incorporated into these programs if the enforcement vendor *can* furnish RFID technology?

Answer: No RFID is currently used at this time. See Answer to Question 15.

Question 61: Attachment 1, #27, We believe 7 year replacement parts may be too extreme. Handheld technology and more often the O/S, may become obsolete after 5 years or less as mobile technology often does. Should this bullet item be "P" for preferred and not "M" for mandatory? Or perhaps amended to 5 years?

Answer: The HHC equipment needs to be supported for the entire term of the contract, including

extensions. The intent behind this requirement is to ensure that all equipment will be fully serviced, upgraded and/or repaired as necessary during the term of the contract. If there are concerns about this requirement, please indicate how you will support the provided equipment throughout the term of the contract.

Question 62: Attachment 1, #36, How many HHC's does this battery of tests really apply to today? Could this at least be "P" for preferred vs. "M"

Answer: Preferred.

Question 63, Attachment 1, #130, Most HHC's do not have a serial port anymore. Should this really be "M" mandatory?

Answer: The requirement as originally stated in Section 130 has been deleted.

Question 64: #Attachment 1, #131, PCMCIA slots are not common components in HHC's today. This might be replaced with "SD Card slot" or optionally SD card slot instead of PCMCIA since they both serve the same purpose?

Answer: The requirement as originally stated in Section 131 has been deleted.

Question 65: Attachment 1,#132, Please describe the City's current existence of RFID tags applied to parking enforcement. Please describe The City's 12 month strategy on where and how RFID tags will be applied making the RFID scanner necessary.

Answer: No RFID is currently used at this time. See answer to Question 15.

Question 66: Will something like Gobi technology be considered?

Answer: The fastest available wireless is preferred. Qualcomm Gobi technology can be considered as long as it meets all the relevant performance and service level requirements in the RFP.

Question 67: Will 3.5G technology be considered if data transfer speeds prove more than acceptable?

Answer: The primary issue is meeting the service level requirements for response time on the HHC. If 3.5G meets the service level requirements over the term of the contract it is acceptable; please provide the reasons for this choice if that is part of the solution.

Question 68: Per system requirement #132 stating: "The HHC may have RFID tag-reader technology that could be used in a meter application to read a meter pole or meter ID. This could be used for meter address identification when writing citations or performing meter maintenance. (As previously stated the HHC must allow for the installation and use of other City applications such as a City-provided RFID tag, installed on its parking meters.), ...want to confirm the supported handheld OS software for City RFID tag software?In our vendor meeting, it was mentioned that the HHC software did not necessarily have to be Windows OS.

Answer: RFID is not currently supported at this time. See answer to Question 15.

**CITY OF CHICAGO
DEPARTMENT OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES**

**JAMIE L RHEE
CHIEF PROCUREMENT OFFICER**

CITY OF CHICAGO - DEPARTMENT OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES

JANUARY 15, 2014

ADDENDUM NO. 2

To

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL ("RFP")

FOR

**MOBILE HANDHELDS FOR PARKING CITATIONS- HARDWARE, SOFTWARE,
SERVICE & SUPPORT**

SPECIFICATION NO: 118791

Consisting of Sections I – IV including this Acknowledgment.

IV. ADDENDUM RECEIPT ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I hereby acknowledge receipt of Addendum No.2 to the RFP named above and further state that I am authorized to execute this Acknowledgment on behalf of the company listed below.

Signature of Authorized Individual

Title

Name of Authorized Individual (Type or Print)

Company Name

Business Telephone Number

<p>Complete and Return this Acknowledgment by facsimile to: 312-744-9687, Attn: Altha Riley, Senior Procurement Specialist</p>
